## Case 5:06-cv-05598-RMW Document 53 Filed 05/07/07 Page 1 of 5

1	SHIRLI F. WEISS, Bar No. 079225		
2	shirli.weiss@dlapiper.com GERARD A. TRIPPITELLI, Bar No. 235788		
3	jerry.trippitelli@dlapiper.com DLA PIPER US LLP		
4	401 B Street, Suite 1700 San Diego, CA 92101-4297		
5	Tel: 619.699.2700 Fax: 619.699.2701		
6	Attorneys for Nominal Defendant Foundry		
7	Networks, Inc. and Defendants Alfred J. Amoroso, C. Nicholas Keating, Jr., J. Steven Young, Laurence		
8	L. Akin, Ken K. Cheng, John P. Burger, Benjamin D. Taft, Paul L. Twombly, Richard W. Bridges, Chandra Kopparapu, Ivy Pei Shan Hsu, Karl D. Triebes, Lee Chen, Robert W. Shackleton, William		
9			
10	S. Kallaos, Andrew K. Ludwick		
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
12	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
13	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
14		<u>*E-FILED - 5/7/07*</u>	
15	IN RE FOUNDRY NETWORKS, INC. DERIVATIVE LITIGATION	Master File No. C-06-05598-RMW	
16	DERIVATIVE LITIGATION	STIPULATION AND [] ORDER AMENDING BRIEFING	
17		SCHEDULE	
18			
19	THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:		
20	ALL ACTIONS		
21			
22	WHEREAS, on December 8, 2006, this Court entered an "Order Consolidating Cases for		
23	All Purposes and Setting Schedule for Filing of Consolidated Complaint (the "Consolidation		
24	Order"); and		
25	WHEREAS, the Consolidation Order included a schedule for (1) Plaintiffs' filing and		
26	service of a consolidated complaint; (2) Nominal Defendant Foundry Network, Inc.'s		
27	("Foundry's") and the individual defendants' answers or other responses to such consolidated		
28	reply briefs relating to a motion to dismiss filed by		
DLA PIPER US LLP SAN DIEGO	STIPULATION AND	-1- MASTER FILE NO. C-06-05598-RMV [] ORDER AMENDING BRIEFING SCHEDULE	

1	Foundry and/or the individual defendants; and
2	WHEREAS, on March 26, 2007, Plaintiffs filed the Consolidated Derivative Complaint
3	(the "Consolidated Complaint"); and
4	WHEREAS, the Consolidated Complaint names the following persons as individual
5	defendants (collectively, the "Individual Defendants"): Bobby R. Johnson, Jr., Alfred J. Amoroso,
6	C. Nicholas Keating, Jr., J. Steven Young, Laurence L. Akin, Timothy D. Heffner, Ken K. Cheng,
7	John P. Burger, Benjamin D. Taft, Paul L. Twombly, Richard W. Bridges, Chandra Kopparapu,
8	Ivy Pei Shan Hsu, Karl D. Triebes, Lee Chen, Robert W. Shackleton, William S. Kallaos and
9	Andrew K. Ludwick; and
10	WHEREAS, Foundry, the Individual Defendants and Plaintiffs have agreed to amend the
11	briefing schedule set forth in the Consolidation Order to facilitate an orderly and efficient briefing
12	of motions to dismiss the Consolidated Complaint under Rules 23.1 and 12(b) of the Federal
13	Rules of Civil Procedure or otherwise, as set forth herein; and
14	THEREFORE, IT IS STIPULATED AND AGREED by Plaintiffs, Foundry and the
15	Individual Defendants, through their respective counsel of record, as follows:
16	1. Paragraphs 9 and 10 of the Consolidation Order are amended and superseded by
17	this Stipulation and Order. All other paragraphs of the Consolidation Order remain in full force
18	and effect.
19	2. No later than 45 days after service of the Consolidated Complaint, Foundry shall
20	file its anticipated motion to dismiss the Consolidated Complaint for Plaintiffs' failure to satisfy
21	the requirements of Rule 23.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for, among other reasons,
22	Plaintiffs' failure to make a pre-suit demand and failure to sufficiently plead that such demand
23	would have been excused (the "Rule 23.1 Motion"). Plaintiffs shall file and serve their
24	opposition to the Rule 23.1 Motion no later than 45 days after service of the Rule 23.1 Motion.
25	Foundry shall file and serve its reply to the opposition no later than 30 days after service of the
26	opposition.
27	3. The Individual Defendants shall not be required to answer or otherwise respond to
28	the Consolidated Complaint unless the Court denies the Rule 23.1 Motion. In the event that the

1	Rule 23.1 Motion is denied, the Individual Defendants shall answer or otherwise respond to the	
2	Consolidated Complaint no later than 45 days after the Court's entry of the Order denying the	
3	Rule 23.1 Motion. In the event that any of the Individual Defendants respond to the Consolidated	
4	Complaint by filing motions directed at the Consolidated Complaint, (1) Plaintiffs shall file and	
5	serve their opposition to such motions no later than 45 days after service of such motions and (2)	
6	the moving Individual Defendants shall file and serve their reply no later than 30 days after	
7	service of the opposition.	
8	4. If Foundry does not file the anticipated Rule 23.1 Motion, Foundry and each of the	
9	Individual Defendants shall answer or otherwise respond to the Consolidated Complaint no later	
10	than 45 days from the date of service of the Consolidated Complaint. In the event that Foundry	
11	and/or any of the Individual Defendants respond by filing any motion directed at the Consolidate	
12	Complaint, (1) Plaintiffs shall file and serve their opposition to any such motion(s) no later than	
13	45 days after the service of such motion(s) and (2) Foundry and/or the Individual Defendants, as	
14	applicable, shall file and serve a reply no later than 30 days after service of the opposition.	
15	5. The parties agree that, by entering into this stipulation, they do not waive any	
16	claim, argument or defense that they may have in this action and that nothing in this stipulation	
17	limits the rights of any party to take any action not inconsistent with its express terms.	
18	Dated: April 17, 2007	
19	DLA PIPER US LLP	
20	By /s/ Shirli F. Weiss	
21	By /s/ Shirli F. Weiss SHIRLI F. WEISS	
22	Attorneys for Nominal Defendant Foundry	
23	Networks, Inc. and Defendants Alfred J. Amoroso, C. Nicholas Keating, Jr., J. Steven Young,	
24	Laurence L. Akin, Ken K. Cheng, John P. Burger, Benjamin D. Taft, Paul L. Twombly, Richard W.	
25	Bridges, Chandra Kopparapu, Ivy Pei Shan Hsu, Karl D. Triebes, Lee Chen, Robert W. Shackleton,	
26	William S. Kallaos, Andrew K. Ludwick	
27		
28	-3-	

DLA PIPER US LLP SAN DIEGO

## Case 5:06-cv-05598-RMW Document 53 Filed 05/07/07 Page 4 of 5

1	1			
2	2 Dated: April 17, 2007 WILSON	SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI PC		
3		/s/ Boris Feldman		
4		S FELDMAN		
5	5 Attorneys	for Defendant Bobby R. Johnson, Jr.		
6				
7				
8	1, SHIKLI F. WEISS, alli the ECF User whose i	I, SHIRLI F. WEISS, am the ECF User whose ID and password are being used to file this		
9	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER AMENDING BRIEFING SCHEDULE. In			
10	compliance with General Order 45, X.B., I hereby attest that BORIS FELDMAN has concurred			
11	in this filing.			
12	Dated: April 17, 2007 KEKER &	z VAN NEST LLP		
13	13			
14		/s/ Elliot R. Peters OT R. PETERS		
15	.5			
16	Attorneys Attorneys	for Defendant Timothy D. Heffner		
17	7			
18	I SHIDI I E WEISS am the ECE User whose ID and t	possword are being used to file this		
19	STIDI II ATIONI AND IDDODOSEDI ODDED AMENI	I, SHIRLI F. WEISS, am the ECF User whose ID and password are being used to file this		
20	30	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER AMENDING BRIEFING SCHEDULE. In		
21		compliance with General Order 45, X.B., I hereby attest that ELLIOT R. PETERS has concurred		
22	in this filing.			
23	23			
24	24			
25	25			
26	26			
27	27			
28	_1_			
LLP	_P	MASTER FILE NO. C-06-05598-RMW		

DLA PIPER US LLP

## Case 5:06-cv-05598-RMW Document 53 Filed 05/07/07 Page 5 of 5

1	Dated: April 17, 2007	SCHIFFRIN BARROWAY TOPAZ & KESSLER
2		LLP
3		By /s/ Alan R. Plutzik ALAN R. PLUTZIK
5		
6		Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs
7		
8	I SHIRLLE WEISS am the ECE User who	ose ID and password are being used to file this
9	I, SHIRLI F. WEISS, am the ECF User whose ID and password are being used to file this STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER AMENDING BRIEFING SCHEDULE. In	
10		
11	compliance with General Order 45, X.B., I hereby attest that ALAN R. PLUTZIK has concurred in this filing.	
12		
13	Dated: April 17, 2007	KELLER ROHRBACK L.L.P.
		By /s/ Julie E. Farris
14		JULIE E. FARRIS
15 16		Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs
17		
18		
19	I, SHIRLI F. WEISS, am the ECF User whose ID and password are being used to file this	
20	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER AMENDING BRIEFING SCHEDULE. In	
20	compliance with General Order 45, X.B., I hereby attest that JULIE E. FARRIS has concurred in	
22	this filing.	
	*	* * *
23	[] ORD	DER
24	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, I'	T IS SO ORDERED.
25	5/7/07	Romandand
<ul><li>26</li><li>27</li></ul>	DATED:5/7/07	Monald M. Whyte THE HONORABLE RONALD M. WHYTE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
28	GT\6527219.1	-5-
LLP		MASTER FILE NO. C-06-05598-RMW

DLA PIPER US SAN DIEGO